



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,757	07/28/2006	Sirilla George Andrew	PU040057	9873
24498	7590	04/01/2009	EXAMINER	
Robert D. Shedd			LEE, MICHAEL	
Thomson Licensing LLC				
2 Independence Way			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5312			2622	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		04/01/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/587,757	Applicant(s) GEORGE ANDREW ET AL.
	Examiner M. Lee	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-6, 12 and13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-6, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. While the claims recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing ("[t]he Supreme Court has recognized only two instances in which such a method may qualify as a section 101 process: when the process 'either [1] was tied to a particular apparatus or [2] operated to change materials to a 'different state or thing.''" See PTO Supp. Br. 4 (quoting *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 588 n.9). In *Diehr*, the Supreme Court confirmed that a process claim reciting an algorithm could state statutory subject matter if it: (1) is tied to a machine or (2) creates or involves a composition of matter or manufacture. 12 450 U.S. at 184." *In re Comiskey*, 84 USPQ2d 1670 (Fed. Cir. 2007). The instant claims neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. In order for a process to be "tied" to another statutory category, the

structure of another statutory category should be positively recited in a step or steps significant to the basic inventive concept, and NOT just in association with statements of intended use or purpose, insignificant pre or post solution activity, or implicitly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prodan (4,959,715).

Regarding claim 1, Prodan discloses a television receiving step (1), a first value determining step (6-12), and a second value replacing step (13,14).

Regarding claim 2, see col. 4, lines 27-29.

Regarding claim 5, the subtracter 7 meets the receiving steps and the difference determining step as claimed, and the output of the comparator 10 meets the first value determining step as claimed.

Regarding claim 6, the signals inputted to the subtracter 7 are time dependent values, which is the same as the time references as claimed.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dokic (5,699,392).

Regarding claim 7, Dokic shows a first oscillator parameter memory (note registers 84 and 82), an input for receiving television signal (51), and a processing

Art Unit: 2622

means (60) for determining a second oscillator parameter and storing the same into memory (84 and 82).

Regarding claim 8, according to steps 115 and 110, a new STC is read when the error is greater than the allowable threshold.

Regarding claim 11, the first and second STC values in registers 84 and 82 are bit rate multipliers.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, in addition of above, the initial PCR loading step 108 meets the first time stamp extraction step as claimed, the subsequent received PCR in step 104 meets the second time stamp extraction step as claimed, the error calculation step 114 meets the determining step as claimed, all the steps in Figures 6B and 6C meet the calculating step as claimed, and the read STC step 110 meets the replacing step as claimed.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 6, see the corresponding rejections as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prodan (4,959,715).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Prodan does not disclose the difference values as claimed. However, Prodan does teach that the threshold reference 9 can be predefined to have any value (note col. 4, lines 6-8). The selection of such value is considered a matter of obvious design choice. That is the threshold reference can be selectively chosen to have the similar values as claimed. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the threshold value to perform the well known functions as claimed.

8. Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dokic (5,699,392).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 14 and 15, Dokic does not disclose the difference values as claimed. However, Dokic does teach that the allowable error threshold 115 can be predefined to have any value (col. 9, lines 9-10). The selection of such threshold is considered a matter of obvious design choice. That is the threshold can be selectively chosen to have the similar values as claimed. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the threshold to perform the well known functions as claimed.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Washington et al. (5,920,572) shows a PCR extractor.

Art Unit: 2622

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran, can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/M. Lee/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622